



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,617	01/27/2004	Michael Dieudonne	31030288 US02/871-011664-	3384
2512	7590	10/19/2006		EXAMINER
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			SOBUTKA, PHILIP	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2618	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/766,617	DIEUDONNE, MICHAEL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Philip J. Sobotka	2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 January 1994 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/27/04.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little et al (GB 2350972) in view of Miller (US 6,990,338).

Little teaches a method of testing user equipment for operational suitability with an in-flight communication system, the method comprising the steps of:

identifying an operator of said user equipment (*Little see page 8, line 15 – page 9, lines 11*),

testing said user equipment for a set of predetermined parameters (*Little see page 12. lines 1-12, page 13, lines 1-7*),

communicating said Pass or Fail status and said operator identity to said in-flight communication system (*Little see page 13, lines 18-21*).

Little lacks a teaching of comparing said test results with a predefined criteria to determine a Pass or Fail status of said user equipment.

Miller teaches a method of testing user equipment for suitability with an in flight communication system in which test results are compared with a predefined criteria to determine if the device can be used or not (*Miller see especially column 4, lines 30-45, column 5, line 25 – column 7, line 66, Tables 1-3*). Miller teaches that this assures

compliance with applicable radiation levels (*Miller* see especially column 1 line 45 – column 2, line 5, column 10, lines 20-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Little to compare the test results to predefined criteria in order to ensure that the only devices allowed to operate confirmed to applicable standards as taught by Miller.

As to claim 2, Little in view of Miller teaches the method as claimed in Claim 1, wherein said user equipment is a mobile phone (*Little* see especially page 8, lines 1-15).

As to claim 3, Little in view of Miller teaches the method as claims in Claim 2, wherein said set of predetermined parameters includes user equipment power level (*Little* see especially page 12 line 18 – page 13, line 7).

As to claim 4, Little in view of Miller teaches the method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the set of predefined parameters includes at least one of adjacent channel leakage and waveform quality (*note that Little teaches testing and adjusting to minimize co-channel interference, i.e. leakage, while maintaining reliable communication, i.e. quality, see page 12, lines 1-7, 19-22*).

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Manssen (US 5,878,209) and Kirkpatrick (US 5,933,776) have been cited to show other mobile phone test arrangements.

Gresham et al (US 2002/0160773) has been cited to show another arrangements for using mobile devices on platforms such as airplanes.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip J Slobutka whose telephone number is 571-272-7887. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew D. Anderson can be reached on 571-272-4711.

5. The central fax phone number for the Office is 571-273-8300.

Most facsimile-transmitted patent application related correspondence is required to be sent to the Central FAX Number.

CENTRALIZED DELIVERY POLICY: For patent related correspondence, hand carry deliveries must be made to the Customer Service Window (now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), and facsimile transmissions must be sent to the Central FAX number, unless an exception applies. For example, if the examiner has rejected claims in a regular U.S. patent application, and the reply to the examiner's Office action is desired to be transmitted by facsimile rather than mailed, the reply must be sent to the Central FAX Number.

6. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/766,617
Art Unit: 2618

Page 5



10/4/06

PHILIP J. SOBUTKA
PATENT EXAMINER

Philip J Sobutka

(571) 272-7887